

GLENVIEW AREA NEIGHBORHOOD PLAN ADVISORY GROUP MEETING MINUTES

January 19, 2010

DRAFT NEIGHBORHOOD PLAN – DISCUSSION

It was suggested that comments such as grammatical errors or typos be sent to Sabak, Wilson & Lingo at a later date so we could focus on the bigger items such as the recommendations. The following subjects were the main discussion items:

- **Commercial & Multi-Family Development** – Under the Land Use & Community Form Recommendations on page 16 (on the draft dated 01-07-10) the “OR” in recommendations 1 & 2 was questioned. It was explained that the recommendation could be written either way and the advisory group should select the option they prefer. It was decided that both commercial and multi-family development should be limited to those properties already zoned for such development. It was suggested that the justification for these recommendations be strengthened to better support them.

The potential for redevelopment of an existing commercial or multi-family site was brought up. It was suggested that recommendations be strengthened to include what new developments might look like. It was mentioned that the Harbortown complex was out of scale with the surrounding area. It was suggested that this language be added to the Neighborhood Plan.

- **Lighting** – It was asked why there were no recommendations regarding lighting in the executive summary. The consultant explained that the items in the executive summary are only those that fall under Cornerstone 2020 and the Land Development Code in the implementation table on pages 24-26. The lighting recommendation that is shown on page 16 as recommendation number 4 is categorized under the infrastructure section of the implementation table. A member of planning and design explained that the whole document will be adopted by the planning commission, but the executive summary is the portion of the document that gets adopted to Cornerstone 2020 and deals with only items that would be a part of land planning regulations. Because this recommendation is site specific, and not county wide, it would not be appropriate for Cornerstone 2020.

The language “only where needed for safety reasons” in recommendation 4 on page 16 was questioned because it could open the door for lights everywhere. The consultant agreed that the language needed to be re-worded but discouraged eliminating lights all together especially since the very next recommendation was to provide lighting on the Glenview entrance. It was suggested that all future lighting require the approval of the City of Glenview.

- **Sidewalks** – It was asked why sidewalks were being addressed for new developments in recommendation number 3 on page 19 instead of prohibited all together. It was explained that it is often impossible to waive the sidewalk requirement for new roads in a development. The purpose of this recommendation is to allow the sidewalks to be incorporated interior to new development in a more sensitive manner without

having to follow the roadway which often creates a very suburban feel. It was noted that waivers for sidewalks on existing roads are often easier to obtain because there are existing conditions such as right of way width and topography that will not allow it. Sidewalks will not be required for private roads.

It was noted that there are two accepted ways to avoid providing sidewalks for a new development; a waiver or paying a fee in lieu. If a fee is paid, that money will go into a fund for the Councilperson to add sidewalks elsewhere in the district

- **Road Width** – It was recommended that the language “without pavement widening” be added to recommendation number 4 on page 19.

IMPLEMENTATION STRATEGIES – DISCUSSION

There are 4 potential implementation strategies that could be applied to portions of the study area. It was noted that it is not an either/or situation but that multiple strategies could be selected. The options were as follows:

Area Wide Re-Zoning – Currently, a majority of the study area meets R-1 zoning standards. A potential area for re-zoning based on lot size was presented for review. It was noted that this area is just a recommendation. A separate process is required to pursue the area wide re-zoning and the final boundary would be determined at that time. There seemed to be a consensus in favor of this strategy.

- **Overlay District** – This would allow more site specific recommendations for things such as building height and orientation, materials, lighting and open space. Two potential areas for an overlay district were discussed. One would be for the City limits of Glenview only. The other would be for the River Road Corridor which would stretch well beyond the study area. The group seemed to think there was potential in an overlay district for the City of Glenview.
- **Local Preservation District** – This would create a high level of preservation for historic resources at a local level with increased regulations for all exterior changes including demolition and new construction. An architectural review committee would be appointed to review all submittals including projects like replacement windows and roofs for compatibility. The existing Country Estates of River Road historic district is an ideal location for this designation because it is already recognized nationally for its unique character. The national register status only protects properties for federally funded projects. As a local preservation district, the properties would be protected at the local level as well.

It was noted that individual properties can apply for Local Landmark status as well. They do not have to be a part of a district. Both Locust Grove and the Bell of Louisville are Local Landmarks. It was suggested that a recommendation be added to encourage property owners pursue designation as a Local Landmark for their own property.

- **Neighborhood Conservation District** – This designation is similar to the Local Preservation District because projects will be reviewed by an architectural review committee, but it is less restrictive because they don't review all exterior changes. They only review demolition, new construction, additions and relocation. The City of Glenview was suggested as a potential boundary for a Neighborhood Conservation District, but the task force seemed to lean more toward an overlay district for this area.

It is important to note that the Neighborhood Conservation District option does not currently exist. Louisville Metro is in the process of creating this strategy, but the process has not been completed.

Currently Louisville Metro is the only municipality that has the ability to create overlay districts or preservation districts. The City of Glenview would have to adopt an ordinance to allow the creation of these districts before pursuing this strategy. A conflict also exists when overlay or preservation districts encompass properties from both municipalities. Metro legal council is researching the best way for this to be coordinated between municipalities.

RIVER ROAD CORRIDOR MANAGEMENT PLAN – UPDATE

- A draft of the River Road Corridor Management Plan has been circulated. It was noted that some recommendations were consistent with the recommendations in the Neighborhood Plan such as tree preservation and river views, however; there are also some recommendations that could be in conflict including a pedestrian connection along Lime Kiln Lane and public access along the old interurban line.

NEXT ADVISORY GROUP MEETING

- The next advisory group meeting was tentatively set for March 16th because there were conflicts on several other dates. Unfortunately a conflict came up on March 16th as well and the new tentative date will be March 9th.
- The agenda for the next meeting will include a revised draft of the plan along with discussion for the neighborhood meeting. It is likely that the final neighborhood meeting will be held in April.